

ADMINISTRATION TEAM MINUTES

Date: February 13, 2004
Time: 9:00 am
Place: Tacoma AGC Building

<u>Attending</u>	Cathy Arnold	✓	Paul Gonseth	✓	Tina Nelson	✓
	Dave Banke	_____	Mike Hall	✓	Cathy Nicholas	✓
	Jerry Brais	_____	Ann Hegstrom	_____	Mark Rohde	✓
	Forrest Dill	✓	Ron Howard	✓	Mark Scoccolo	✓
	Doug Ficco	✓	Carl Jonasson	✓	Greg Waugh	✓
	Bob Glenn	_____	Dave Jones	✓	Tom Zamzow	_____

Opening The minutes of the January 16th meeting were approved.

Old Business

Ron Howard noted that he had sent out the List of Construction Office Assistants and their assignments, the updated traffic control surveys, the draft 1-08 specification and the equipment rental rate agreement updates.

This led to a brief discussion of the rental rate agreement and the fact that Primedia will be updating the blue book semiannually, rather than quarterly. It was agreed at the last meeting to change the specification to make the rates effective 14 days after Primedia updates the rates. Mention was made that they are available through Iron Max, an online applications, sooner than 14 days. The question was raised on when the rates would be effective. It was noted that state forces use the CD's and the 14 days would give us time for distribution. It was agreed to make new rates effective 14 days after Primedia releases them. The revised wording for the specification was adopted.

David Jones gave an update on where the Prompt Pay Task Force was in its efforts. David noted the Task Force consisted of Ann Hegstrom, Kiewit Construction, Scott Bernhard, Max J. Kuney Company, Joe Spink, Wilder Construction Company, John Chi, WSDOT Project Engineer, Barbara Wolosyn, WSDOT Office Engineer, Lynn Rust, WSDOT's Southwest Region, and himself. The first meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 25, 2004 at John Chi's Field Office in Seattle.

MINUTES (cont)

Date: February 13, 2004

Page 2

Old Business (cont)

The next item discussed was progress schedules as they relate to section 1-08.3 of the specifications. The first paragraph was reviewed and discussed. It was noted that the revised specification requires the contractor to communicate the work planned until the schedule is available. The first paragraph was adopted.

The second paragraph was discussed. Mark Scoccolo asked about the need for the schedule to be submitted within 30 days. It was pointed out that some projects might only be 30 days long. It was pointed out by the group that there was already a General Special Provision (GSP) that addresses less complex projects. The GSP allows for the use of a bar chart in place of the standard specification critical path method. Ron also handed out the GSP's that modified the standard specifications for flexible start dates.

Paul Gonseth handed out several different diagrams that could be considered critical path methods; Arrow Diagram, Precedence Diagram, and GANNT charts. Paul led a discussion of these different diagrams as well as his suggested changes to this paragraph of the specifications.

Several people brought up the high cost of software and it was decided not to specify a particular software, but focus on the information required. Greg Waugh suggested that all the information Paul had listed could be derived from a color bar chart and a print out of the activities showing the ties or the critical path. The discussion continued on, around the idea that you may need several different levels of complexity in the schedule depending on the complexity of the project.

Ron Howard suggested that the standard should include one level, that most often needed and that any others would be in the GSP's. Perhaps one GSP for the small or simple jobs and another GSP for the complex jobs. Ron also stated the purpose for asking for the schedule should be so the contractor can show that the contractor's work plan will accomplish the work in the time specified, allow the contracting agency to determine its work force needs as they relate to the project, and to be able to assess changes to the work and the completion date of the project.

MINUTES (cont)

Date: February 13, 2004

Page 3

Old Business (cont)

Bob Adams, a visitor from the AGC/WSDOT Lead Team, cautioned us to insure that we not make it too complicated, but that enough information be given to accomplish what is needed, to know what work will be completed in the near future and what effect

changes have on the completion date. Bob also noted that the last sentence of the 2nd paragraph already is in the next section of the standard specifications. Ron asked for volunteers to take the information discussed and redraft this part of the specification for next time. Paul Gonseth agreed to take this on.

The next item put up for discussion was how to handle early completion. When the contractor submits a schedule that indicates the project will be completed ahead of the specified working days. Ron pointed out that when the contractor is delayed in not meeting the early completion of the project the contracting agency often is expected to pay for the delay costs. Mark Scoccolo brought up a recent situation where they put their resources into completing the work early only to have the weather shut them down and delay the paving until the spring. When they asked for delay damages they were told that since working days had not expired they were not entitled to be compensated for the delay, as one did not occur. Mark acknowledged that this was not a WSDOT project and that nothing of this nature has happened recently on State projects.

Ron suggested that if the contracting agency is expected to pay for delay damages on a early completion schedule it only seems fair that when a early schedule is submitted that the working days be reduced to protect the contracting agencies investment in resources to make that happen, otherwise there is no risk to the contractor and an additional expense to the contracting agency. Greg Waugh pointed out that the contractor has invested resources to finish early and that if they don't, they lose money, so there is no wind fall when they fail to meet their planned early project completion.

Tina Nelson mentioned that when they have an early completion schedule they make the contractor sign a statement that would not hold them responsible if that early schedule was not met. Several people brought up the idea about float time and who would own it. Mark Scoccolo noted that this all sounds like A + B bidding. Carl Jonasson suggested that maybe we consider using a change order with language similar to what Tina suggested.

Mark asked if we were going to have time to discuss section 1-08.4, Ron said yes in the future. Lunch was approaching and Ron asked what the group's feelings were

MINUTES (cont)

Date: February 13, 2004

Page 4

Old Business (cont)

about continuing after lunch. Several members had afternoon meetings so it was decided to adjourn the meeting.

Future Meetings

March 12th, 2004 @ Tacoma AGC (9:00 am)

April 16th, 2004 @ Tacoma AGC (9:00 am)

May 14th, 2004 @ Tacoma AGC (9:00 am in the Boardroom)

June 11th, 2004 @ Tacoma AGC (9:00 am)

Assignment List

Who

Paul Gonseth

What

Revised 2nd paragraph

By When

March 13, 2004

Team's "Round Tuit" List

1. Traffic Control Provisions
2. Insurance
3. Progress Schedules
 - Short-term Scheduling
 - Section 1-08.8, p5.c—Extensions for Quantity Overruns?
4. Disputes Review Boards
5. Tort Claims Liability/Accident Reports
6. Bid Item for On-site Overhead
7. Joint Training—Documentation
8. Payroll, Wage Administration procedures
9. Materials on Hand provisions
10. Web-Based Construction Management